

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 27-37, 64-112 were pending at the time of the action.
- Herein Applicant withdraws claims 93-100.
- Herein Applicant amends claims 27, 31, 32, 37, 64, 67, 68, 79, 82, 83, 102, 103, 106, 109, 110, and 112.
- Herein Applicant presents claims 27-37, 64-92, and 101-112 for examination.

Support for the claim amendments is found throughout the originally filed application; for example, support may be found at least in the section titled "Bookmarks" and at paragraphs [0112], [0154], and [0155]. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce new matter.

### **Restriction**

Claims 93-100 stand restricted by original presentation as belonging to a non-elected group from the January 25, 2008 restriction requirement in this application. Applicant maintains traversal of the restriction.

Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicant herein withdraws claims 93-100 as shown above.

### **Claims 27-35, 64-72, and 79 Recite Statutory Subject Matter**

Claims 27-35, 64-72, and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims 27, 64, and 79 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 101 rejection moot.

### **Claim 37 Complies With § 112, 2nd Paragraph**

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The application as originally filed describes, either explicitly or implicitly, the claimed means such that one of ordinary skill in the art of multimedia presentation resumption at the time the application was filed would recognize the structure and/or acts corresponding to the claimed means.

For example, the application describes a hub or node, e.g., 114, 124, 134, 144, and alternately a set-top box corresponding to “means for presenting a UI on the first multimedia presentation system.” *See Application*, [0048]-[0050].

As another example, the application describes a remote control, a “resume from” action, and a “user interface application and user interface lights, buttons, controls, etc. to facilitate viewer interaction,” input interfaces for a hub and a node, and flow charts describing steps corresponding to “means for receiving user input through the UI that indicates a user request to resume presentation.” *See Application*, [0067]-[0069], [0074]-[0076], [0079], [0099], [00104]-[00110] (flow chart), [00123] (“resume from”), [0134], [0135] (input interface 1326), [00139], [0147] (input interface 1426), [0148], and FIGs. 1, 2, 5, 6, 13, and 14.

As yet another example, the application describes a network interface and an input interface corresponding to “means for requesting that a communicatively coupled multimedia server stream....” *Application*, FIGs. 6, 13 (network interface 1324, input interface 1326), and 14 (network interface 1424, input interface 1426) and Specification corresponding text.

As still another example, the application describes a node presentation system corresponding to “means for presenting the multimedia program at the first multimedia presentation system from the position of the bookmark,” in the context of claim 37. See *Application*, FIG. 2, 220, FIG. 14, and Specification corresponding text.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the application as originally filed describes appropriate structure and/or acts corresponding to the claimed means, and Applicant submits that the claims encompass such described means and equivalents thereto. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 112, 2nd Paragraph rejections.

### **Cited Documents**

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Vasilevsky:** Vasilevsky, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0166258
- **Bowman:** Bowman, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0174431
- **Ellis:** Ellis, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0028208
- **Yui:** Yui, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0246746

**Claims 27-37, 64-87, and 101-112 Are Non-Obvious Over Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis**

Claims 27-37, 64-87, and 101-112 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, solely in the interest of expediting issuance, Applicant amends claims 27, 31, 32, 37, 64, 67, 68, 79, 82, 83, 102, 103, 106, 109, 110, and 112 as shown above. Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider the claims of this application.

**Independent Claims 27 and 37**

**Claim 27** recites, in part:

receiving, through the first UI, a user request to send a bookmark to a specified second locus from among the multiple loci, the second locus including a second multimedia presentation system...

sending the bookmark to the second multimedia presentation system at the second locus;

in response to the second multimedia presentation system receiving the bookmark, and without user interaction, presenting a second UI on the second multimedia presentation system, the second UI prompting for user-selection to resume the multimedia program at the second multimedia presentation system

Similarly, **claim 37** recites, in part:

means for presenting a UI on the first multimedia presentation system, the UI including a display of the bookmark and a prompt for user input to accept the bookmark and resume presentation of the multimedia program at the first multimedia presentation system, the UI being presented in direct response to receiving the bookmark, the UI not being presented in response to user interaction with the first multimedia presentation system;

means for receiving user input through the UI that indicates a user request to resume presentation of the multimedia program from the position of the bookmark;

Assuming for the sake of argument that Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis are properly combinable, which Applicant does not concede, such a combination does not teach or suggest at least the quoted language of claims 27 or 37 shown above. Vasilevsky describes “[a] centralized Digital Video Recording (DVR) and reproduction system” where “a program being viewed on one receiver can be paused [and l]ater ... resumed from the same pause point and viewed, but from a different receiver.” *Vasilevsky*, Abstract and [0049]. The Office acknowledges that Vasilevsky does not teach or suggest each element of claims 27 or 37, and the Office cites Bowman and Ellis in an effort to remedy the deficiency.

Bowman describes “bookmark[s]...generated in response to the user inquiry, wherein the first bookmark includes information describing the time and date of broadcast and the station identifier from the user inquiry” in a system where a “broadcast segment database associated with respective broadcast times, broadcast dates, station identifiers, and identification information” is maintained. *Bowman*, Abstract.

Meanwhile, Ellis describes a “system [that] provides a user with an opportunity to adjust program guide settings with a given one of the interactive television program guides.” *Ellis*, Abstract. Further, Ellis describes “provid[ing] a user with the opportunity to remotely schedule program reminders when the user indicates a desire to set a program reminder” and goes on to say in regards to scheduling reminders that they may be “a predefined user-selectable number of minutes, hours or days.” *Id.*, [0117].

However, Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “the first UI providing a listing of multiple loci within a physical

environment to which a bookmark can be sent; [and] sending the bookmark to the second multimedia presentation system at the second locus,” as recited in claim 27. While the Office cites Bowman to reject this element, (*Action*, p. 7), Bowman instead merely describes that a “***user registers to use the retrieval service by completing a user-profile***. The user also indicates the destination for responses from DPS 122, such as mobile device 110, computer 112 or Internet storage site 126.” *Bowman*, [0023]. In *Bowman* a “destination” is indicated at the time of registration, thereby not allowing for “presenting a first user interface (UI) [and] through the first UI, a user request to send a bookmark to a specified second locus from among the multiple loci,” as recited in claim 27.

Furthermore, the purported combination of Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis fails to discuss “a second presentation system,” as recited in claim 27. As mentioned above, Bowman states that, “[t]he user also ***indicates the destination for responses*** from DPS 122, such as mobile device 110, computer 112 or Internet storage site 126.” *Id.*, [0023]. In other words, in Bowman, the user chooses among “a mobile device”, “computer”, or “Internet storage site”, but the destination chosen is static and singular. Bowman states, “the song title or sound recording is stored in either user-selected database 122A or Internet storage site 126 associated with the user ID code.” *Id.*, [0026]. Earlier, Bowman states that “[t]he user identification code is assigned when the user completes a user profile in becoming a subscriber to the retrieval system.” *Id.*, [0016]. Additionally, Bowman does not describe “sending [a] bookmark to the second presentation system.” Bowman instead merely discusses that, “the song title or

sound recording is stored in either user-selected database 122A or Internet storage site 126,” as discussed above. *Id.*, [0026].

*In sum*, Bowman discusses *assigning a “user identification code ... when the user completes a user profile”, the “user identification code” and corresponding “user profile” being used to detect the “destination for responses from DPS” in order to store “the song title or sound recording” at the destination*, and not “the first UI providing a listing of multiple loci within a physical environment to which a bookmark can be sent; sending the bookmark to the second multimedia presentation system at the second locus,” as recited in claim 27. The Office does not cite Ellis to remedy this deficiency, nor does Ellis so teach.

Moreover, Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “in response to the second multimedia presentation system receiving the bookmark, and ***without user interaction, presenting a second UI on the second multimedia presentation system***, the second UI prompting for user-selection to resume the multimedia program at the second multimedia presentation system,” as recited in claim 27 or “presenting a UI ..., the UI including a display of the bookmark and a prompt for user input to accept the bookmark and resume presentation of the multimedia program ..., the UI being presented in direct response to receiving the bookmark, ***the UI not being presented in response to user interaction***,” as recited in claim 37. While the Office cites Ellis to reject this quoted element of claim 27 and bases the rejection of claim 37 on that of claim 27, (*Action*, pp. 8 and 12), Ellis instead merely discusses a program reminder that “may be displayed (e.g., in the form of a pop-up window or message) on user television equipment.” *Ellis*, [0118].

Ellis describes the reminders as “a predefined **user-selectable** number of minutes, hours or days.” *Id.*, [0117] (emphasis added). Reminders in Ellis requiring user selection contradicts “causing the second presentation system to present, without user interaction, a user interface indicating the ability to resume.”

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 27 or 37. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claims 27 and 37.

### Dependent Claims 28-36

Claims 28-36 ultimately depend from independent claim 27. As discussed above, claim 27 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 28-36 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

For example, **claim 31**, as amended, recites:

One or more computer storage media as recited in claim 27,  
wherein the second UI graphically illustrates at least one of the following:  
    a category of the multimedia program;  
    a locus of a system where the multimedia program was  
bookmarked;  
    chronological time when the multimedia program was bookmarked;  
    chronological date when the multimedia program was bookmarked;  
or  
    relative time when the multimedia program was bookmarked.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 31 is moot in light of the amendment. Neither Vasilevsky, nor Bowman, nor Ellis, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests these features.



As another example, **claim 32**, as amended, recites:

One or more computer storage media as recited in claim 27, wherein the second UI includes a listing of broadcast media programs that have one or more bookmarks and were bookmarked within a selected time.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 32 is moot in light of the amendment. Neither Vasilevsky, nor Bowman, nor Ellis, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests “a listing of broadcast media programs that have one or more bookmarks and were bookmarked within a selected time,” as recited in amended claim 32.

While Vasilevsky describes that a program can be paused and resumed from the pause later at a different receiver, and Ellis describes “provid[ing] a user with the opportunity to remotely schedule program reminders at a predefined user-selectable number of minutes, hours or days, neither of these documents nor Bowman teaches or suggests a listing of programs that “were bookmarked within a selected time,” as recited in amended claim 32.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claims 28-36.

*Independent Claims 64, 76, 79, 80, and 86*

The Office rejects independent claims 64, 76, 79, 80, and 86 based on the rejection of claim 27. As discussed above, claim 27 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 64, 76, 79, 80, and 86 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least similar reasons as those discussed above regarding claim 27.

Moreover, for example, **claim 79**, as amended, recites, in part:

communicating over the local area network with the second multimedia presentation system to present a second UI on the second multimedia presentation system, wherein the UI on the second multimedia system includes at least one of:

a list of programs that have been bookmarked during a defined time; or

an invitation to accept the bookmark and resume the multimedia program at the second multimedia presentation system, wherein the second UI is presented on the second multimedia presentation system independent of receiving user input.

None of the cited documents, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest that a “UI on the second multimedia system includes at least one of: a list of programs that have been bookmarked during a defined time,” as recited in amended claim 79.

As discussed above, while Vasilevsky may describe that a program can be paused and resumed from the pause later at a different receiver, and Ellis may describe “provid[ing] a user with the opportunity to remotely schedule program reminders at a predefined user-selectable number of minutes, hours or days, neither of these documents nor Bowman teaches or suggests *a UI including a list of programs that have been bookmarked during a predefined time*, as recited in amended claim 79.

For at least the additional reasons presented herein, the combination of Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 79. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claim 79.

Dependent Claims 65-75, 77, 78, 81-85 and 87

Claims 65-75, 77, 78, 81-85 and 87 each ultimately depend from one of independent claims 64, 76, 80, or 86. As discussed above, claims 64, 76, 80, and 86 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 65-75, 77, 78, 81-85 and 87 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claims 65-75, 77, 78, 81-85 and 87.

Independent Claim 101

Claim 101 recites, in part:

a computing unit configured to: ... perform at least one of:  
swap the first receiver with the second receiver if the bookmark is accessed on the second multimedia presentation system, to associate the first receiver with the second multimedia presentation system and to associate the second receiver with the first multimedia presentation system; or  
share the first receiver if the bookmark is accessed on the second multimedia presentation system, to present on the first multimedia presentation system the multimedia program from the first receiver, and to present on the second multimedia presentation system the multimedia program from the first receiver;  
wherein a user interface (UI) associated with the first multimedia presentation system is configured to prompt for a location to which to send a bookmark generated at the first multimedia presentation system, and wherein a UI at a second multimedia presentation system, to which the bookmark was sent, is configured to prepare, ***independent of user input***, for selection by a user, an indication that a program has arrived at the second multimedia presentation system and is ready to resume presentation as indicated by the bookmark.

Assuming for the sake of argument that Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis are properly combinable, which Applicant does not concede, such a combination does not teach or suggest at least the quoted language of claim 101 shown above.

Vasilevsky describes “[a] centralized Digital Video Recording (DVR) and reproduction system...[that] allows users to not only access the same program or programs from different receivers, but to pause and resume the same programs from the same marker points (‘bookmarks’).” *Vasilevsky*, Abstract. As the Office acknowledges, (Action pp. 19-20), Vasilevsky fails to teach or suggest the following as recited in claim 101:

wherein a user interface (UI) associated with the first multimedia presentation system is configured to prompt for a location to which to send a bookmark generated at the first multimedia presentation system, and wherein a UI at a second multimedia presentation system, to which the bookmark was sent, is configured to prepare, independent of user input, for selection by a user, an indication that a program has arrived at the second multimedia presentation system and is ready to resume presentation as indicated by the bookmark.

The Office cites Bowman and Ellis in an effort to remedy this deficiency. As discussed above, neither Bowman nor Ellis, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest “a second multimedia presentation system ... configured to prepare, ***independent of user input***, for selection by a user, an indication that a program has arrived at the second multimedia presentation system,” as recited in claim 101 (emphasis added). Vasilevsky instead teaches a retrievable list of bookmarks ***which the user can select*** in order to resume the program. *Vasilevsky*, [0058]. For the sake of argument, should Vasilevsky be employed in comparison to the claimed feature, extra user interaction would be required because of the abovementioned limitation of Vasilevsky. Bowman teaches nothing more than bookmarks including the time and date of broadcast and the station identifier being stored in a system where a “broadcast segment database associated with respective

broadcast times, broadcast dates, station identifiers, and identification information” is maintained. *Bowman*, Abstract.

Meanwhile, Ellis merely discusses a program reminder that “may be displayed (e.g., in the form of a pop-up window or message) on user television equipment.” *Ellis*, [0118]. Ellis teaches that the reminders are no more than “a predefined **user-selectable** number of minutes, hours or days.” *Id.*, [0117] (emphasis added). Thus, reminders in Ellis requiring user selection contradict, “causing the second presentation system to present, without user interaction, a user interface indicating the ability to resume.”

Consequently, the combination of Vasilevsky in view of Bowman and Ellis does not teach or suggest at least this element of claim 101. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claim 101.

### Independent Claim 106

Claim 106, as amended, recites:

A multimedia system comprising:  
a multimedia server comprising a first tuner and a second tuner, the first tuner operable to receive a first multimedia program, and the second tuner operable to receive a second multimedia program;  
a first presentation system coupled to the multimedia server and associated with the first tuner, the first presentation system operable to receive and present the first multimedia program and a user interface (UI) to receive a user-submitted request to bookmark a location within the first multimedia program; and  
a second presentation system coupled to the multimedia server and associated with the second tuner, the second presentation system operable to receive and present the second multimedia program;  
wherein the multimedia server is configured to:  
receive from the first presentation system, the user-submitted request to bookmark the location within the first multimedia program;

in response to the user-submitted request, store the bookmark in association with the first multimedia program and, without receiving a request from the second presentation system, for a predefined time send an indication of the bookmark to the second presentation system; and  
resume presentation of the first multimedia program at the second presentation system.

Assuming for the sake of argument that Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis are properly combinable, which Applicant does not concede, such a combination does not teach or suggest each element and feature of amended claim 106.

Vasilevsky describes “[a] centralized Digital Video Recording (DVR) and reproduction system” where “a program being viewed on one receiver can be paused...[and l]ater...resumed from the same pause point and viewed, but from a different receiver.” *Vasilevsky*, Abstract and [0049]. However, Vasilevsky does not teach or suggest a “first presentation system operable to receive and present the first multimedia program and a user interface (UI) to receive a user-submitted request to bookmark a location within the first multimedia program,” as recited in amended claim 106. Instead, Vasilevsky simply discusses that when a viewer pauses program playback, the viewer “can decide whether to ‘bookmark’ the program.” *Id.*, [0051]. While Vasilevsky describes displaying a toolbar containing stored bookmarks for a program that can be accessed by pressing a “bookmarks” button, the bookmarks displayed in the toolbar have already been saved. *Id.*, [0055]. Ellis and Bowman fail to remedy this deficiency.

Moreover, none of the cited documents, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a multimedia server being configured to, in response to receiving a “user-submitted request, store the bookmark in association with the first multimedia

program and, without receiving a request from the second presentation system, for a predefined time send an indication of the bookmark to the second presentation system,” as recited in amended claim 106.

While Vasilevsky describes that a program can be paused and resumed from the pause later at a different receiver, and Ellis describes “provid[ing] a user with the opportunity to remotely schedule program reminders at a predefined user-selectable number of minutes, hours or days, neither of these documents nor Bowman teaches or suggests *sending an indication of a bookmark for a predefined time*, as recited in amended claim 106.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Ellis does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 106. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claim 106.

#### Dependent Claims 102-105 and 107-112

Claims 102-105 and 107-112 each ultimately depend from one of independent claims 101 or 106. As discussed above, claims 101 and 106 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 102-105 and 107-112 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claims 102-105 and 107-112.

## **Claims 88-92 Are Non-Obvious Over Vasilevsky, Bowman, Yui, and Ellis**

Claims 88-92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Vasilevsky, Bowman, Yui, and Ellis. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

### **Independent Claim 88**

Claim 88 recites, in part:

receiving, through the first UI, a user request to send a bookmark to a specified second locus from among the multiple loci, the second locus including a second multimedia presentation system...

sending the bookmark to the second multimedia presentation system at the second locus;

in response to the second multimedia presentation system receiving the bookmark, and without user interaction, presenting a second UI on the second multimedia presentation system, the second UI prompting for user-selection to resume the multimedia program at the second multimedia presentation system

The purported combination of Vasilevsky, Bowman, Yui, and Ellis does not teach or suggest each element and feature of claim 88.

Vasilevsky describes “[a] centralized Digital Video Recording (DVR) and reproduction system” where “a program being viewed on one receiver can be paused...[and l]ater...resumed from the same pause point and viewed, but from a different receiver.” *Vasilevsky*, Abstract and [0049].

Meanwhile, Bowman describes “bookmark[s]...generated in response to the user inquiry, wherein the first bookmark includes information describing the time and date of broadcast and the station identifier from the user inquiry” in a system where a “broadcast segment database associated with respective broadcast times, broadcast dates, station identifiers, and identification information” is maintained. *Bowman*, Abstract.



In addition, Yui describes

movement made by a user viewing a television broadcast program...detected via a transmitting and receiving unit to which an electronic key card is held...[and] a destination of the user is detected via a transmitting and receiving unit to which the electronic key card is held...thereby enabling a continuation of the broadcast program that was viewed to be viewed in a room at the destination.

*Yui*, Abstract.

As discussed previously, Ellis describes a “system [that] provides a user with an opportunity to adjust program guide settings with a given one of the interactive television program guides.” *Ellis*, Abstract. In particular, Ellis describes “provid[ing] a user with the opportunity to remotely schedule program reminders when the user indicates a desire to set a program reminder” and goes on to say in regards to scheduling reminders that they may be “a predefined user-selectable number of minutes, hours or days.” *Id.*, paragraph [0117].

However, the cited documents, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, “indicating a presentation system available on the local area network to which the bookmark generated at the first presentation system is to be sent,” as recited in claim 88. Bowman, which states that, “the ***user registers to use the retrieval service by completing a user-profile***,” does not remedy this deficiency. See *Bowman*, [0023]. In Bowman, “[t]he user also indicates the destination for responses from DPS 122, such as mobile device 110, computer 112 or Internet storage site 126.” *Bowman*, [0023]. The “destination” is indicated at the time of registration, not in response to a “prompt for user input,” as recited in claim 88.

Furthermore, the cited documents are silent with regard to the ability to “indicat[e]...presentation system[s] available on the local area network,” as recited in claim 88.

Moreover, the references fail to teach or suggest the following from claim 88:

the presentation system to which the bookmark is sent, is configured to prepare...an indication that the user has arrived at the second presentation system and is ready to resume the first multimedia program as indicated by the bookmark, ***the indication being prepared in direct response to receiving the bookmark and independent of any user interaction*** with the second presentation system.

The Office cites Yui in an effort to remedy the deficiency of Vasilevsky on the subject of the above quote. However, Yui also fails to discuss, “the indication being prepared in direct response to receiving the bookmark ***and independent of any user interaction***,” as recited in claim 88. Rather, Yui discusses:

detect[ing] movement of the user; destination detecting means for detecting that the user has moved to a position corresponding to one electronic device of the plurality of electronic devices; and reproduction controlling means for controlling an electronic device for reproducing the content and the electronic device at a destination by the communicating means to reproduce the content from a position corresponding to the information indicating the reproduction position stored by the storing means and ***allow the content to be used at the electronic device at the destination when the destination detecting means detects that the user has moved***.

Yui, [0011].

Yui requires “user interaction” to “allow the content to be used at the electronic device at the destination.” Yui is contrary to “the indication being prepared...independent of any user interaction,” as recited in the claim. Without “destination detecting means ***detect[ing] that the user has moved***”, the system of Yui will not “allow the content to be used at the electronic device at the destination.”

In addition, the combination of Vasilevsky, Bowman, and Yui, does not teach or suggest, “the indication being prepared in direct response to receiving the bookmark and independent of any user interaction,” as has been discussed previously as lacking from Ellis.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Vasilevsky, Bowman, Yui, and Ellis does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 88. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claim 88.

#### Dependent Claims 89-92

Claims 89-92 each depend from independent claim 88. As discussed above, claim 88 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 89-92 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the § 103 rejection of claims 88-92.

## **Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

By: /Bea Koempel-Thomas 58213/ Dated: October 7, 2011

Bea Koempel-Thomas  
(bea@leehayes.com; 509-944-4759)  
Registration No. 58213

Colin D. Barnitz  
(colin@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5002)  
Registration No. 35061